

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 17-0804V

Filed: February 2, 2018

UNPUBLISHED

JULIA HAYES,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;  
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;  
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine  
Administration (SIRVA)

*Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for petitioner.*

*Traci R. Patton, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.*

### **RULING ON ENTITLEMENT**<sup>1</sup>

**Dorsey**, Chief Special Master:

On June 15, 2017, petitioner filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*,<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that that her influenza (“flu”) vaccination on September 29, 2016 caused her to suffer a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”). Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On February 1, 2018, respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent’s Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, respondent indicates that

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, the undersigned intends to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, the undersigned agrees that the identified material fits within this definition, the undersigned will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

DICP has reviewed the petition and medical records filed in this case and has concluded that compensation is appropriate in this case. DICP has concluded that petitioner's alleged injury is consistent with SIRVA, as defined on the Vaccine Injury Table. Specifically, petitioner's pain occurred within 48 hours of receipt of an intramuscular vaccination, pain was limited to the shoulder in which the vaccine was administered, and no other condition or abnormality was identified to explain her shoulder pain. 42 C.F.R. § 100.3(a),(c)(10).

*Id.* at 3. (footnote omitted).

**In view of respondent's position and the evidence of record, the undersigned finds that petitioner is entitled to compensation.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Nora Beth Dorsey**

Nora Beth Dorsey  
Chief Special Master